

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF TITLE I



2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN*

*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are not identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

DISTRICT INFORMATION	SCHOOL INFORMATION
District: ATLANTIC CITY	School: Brighton Avenue School
Chief School Administrator: DONNA HAYE	Address: 30 N. Brighton Avenue
Chief School Administrator's E-mail: dhaye@acboe.org	Grade Levels: K-5
Title I Contact: Mrs. Gabrielle Caldwell	Principal: Mrs. Leslie White-Coursey
Title I Contact E-mail: gcaldwell@acboe.org	Principal's E-mail: lcoursey@acboe.org
Title I Contact Phone Number: 609-343-7200 Ex. 5004	Principal's Phone Number: 609-343-3150

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☐ I certify that I have been included in consultations related to the priority needs of my school and participated in the completion of the Schoolwide Plan. As an active member of the planning committee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Needs Assessment and the selection of priority problems. I concur with the information presented herein, including the identification of programs and activities that are funded by Title I, Part A.

Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

Critical Overview Elements

- The School held ____10____ stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$ _____, which comprised _____% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$ _____, which will comprise _____% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

Item	Related to Priority Problem #	Related to Reform Strategy	Budget Line Item (s)	Approximate Cost
Summer School – July 2015	1,2			
After School Program (October-April)	1,2			
Professional Development	1,2			
Leveled Literacy Intervention	1			
Reading Recovery	1			
Basic Skills	1,2			
Accelerated Reading	1			
Parent Center Workshops	3			
Summer School STEM Program	1, 2			
Saturday STEM program	1, 2			
School-based Mentoring Program	3			

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): "The comprehensive plan shall be . . . developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

Note: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note:** A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

***Add lines as necessary.**

Name	Stakeholder Group	Participated in Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Participated in Plan Development	Participated in Program Evaluation	Signature
Lucia Daniel Melissa Greiner	Parents	X	X	X	
Leslie White-Coursey Tracey Singer-Allen	School Staff- Administration	X	X	X	
Zacha Ortiz Daniel Keck	School Staff – Classroom Teachers	X	X	X	
Jennifer Grocki Shannon DePersenaire	School Staff – Literacy Coaches	X	X	X	
Kimberly Taboga	School Staff – ESL	X	X	X	
Indra Owens	School Staff – Guidance	X	X	X	
John Bennett	School Staff - Media Specialist	X	X	X	
Kendall Brown	School Staff – Support	X	X	X	
Mary Hartig	School Staff – Nurse	X	X	X	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

Ed DeMaggio	School Staff – Technology	X	X	X	
Patricia Moody	School Staff – Security	X	X	X	
Management & Evaluation Associations	Consultants	X	X	X	
Joann Allgeyer-Manning	School Staff – Reading Recovery/LLI	X	X	X	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings

Purpose:

The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

Date	Location	Topic	Agenda on File		Minutes on File	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
October 9, 2014	Atlantic City Boathouse	District Leadership Meeting – Fidelity of Implementation Tool, School Based Leadership Teams	X		X	
October 21, 2014	Vice Principal's Conference Room	M & E Articulation – Planning Meeting, Surveys, Rainbow Sheets	X		X	
January 22, 2015	Vice Principal's Conference Room	M & E Articulation – Primary and Intermediate Data, Survey Revisions	X		X	
April 16, 2015	Boathouse	District Leadership Meeting – Examination of Instruction Supporting CCSS, Fidelity of Implementation, District Data, Action Planning	X		X	
April 20, 2015	Vice Principal's Conference Room	M & E Articulation – Primary and	X		X	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

		Intermediate PPMCC Data				
May 13, 2015	Vice Principal's Conference Room	Comprehensive Needs Assessment	X		X	
May 14, 2015	Vice Principal's Conference Room	School-wide Plan Development	X		X	
May 26, 2015	Vice Principal's Conference Room	School-wide Plan Development	X		X	
May 27, 2015	Vice Principal's Conference Room	Program Evaluation	X		X	
June 8, 2015	Atlantic City Boathouse	District Leadership Team Meeting	X		X	

**Add rows as necessary.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)*

School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?	It is the mission of Brighton Avenue School to encourage and develop EXCELLENCE of students and staff. We will provide a supportive environment while implementing research based best practices and the use of technology. It is our goal to empower all students with the knowledge, skills, and integrity needed to contribute and succeed as responsible, life-long learners in a competitive global community.
--	---

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program *

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

In Language Arts, the Literacy Collaborative Framework (Lesley University) and district literacy curriculum were implemented as planned. New teachers or teachers new to a grade level attended initial training (48 hours) twice a month with trained literacy coordinators who provided professional development. All teachers in the building received additional professional development bi-monthly during principal's meetings run by literacy coordinators and scheduled grade level meetings. Teachers were encouraged to reflect on their instructional practice, and continue to refine their teaching through coaching sessions with a literacy coordinator 1-2 times monthly. Additionally, teachers and leadership team members all had the opportunity to meet with Measurement and Evaluation Associates to examine school, district, and state assessment data and use this information to inform classroom instruction and interventions.

Reading Recovery was utilized as an intervention for students in Grade 1, and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) was used for students in Grades 1 and 2. Both interventions were used to serve the lowest 20% of the student population in grades 1-2.

In Mathematics, teachers used the Pearson Access program, 5E math model, and district mathematics curriculum. Teachers attended one professional development session afterschool with a math coach, and one half-day session with other teachers in the district. In addition, periodic grade level meetings were held with a math coach to discuss benchmark and fluency data.

For parent and community involvement, monthly PAC meetings were held, and various guest speakers were invited to speak. Additional parent workshops were held during the course of the year. Activities were planned to bring members of the community into the schools, such as Career Day, Read Across America Day, and Pizza with the Police.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Teachers were given extensive professional development in literacy through grade level meetings, initial training, and principal's meetings/ongoing training. Literacy assessment data was collected for each class via Portfolio Progress Monitoring Class Checklists (PPMCC), and meetings were held to discuss the implications of the data on classroom instruction. The literacy framework was supported with interventions such as Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and Reading Recovery. Mathematics assessment data was collected and discussed during grade-level meetings. Parental involvement was encouraged with monthly PAC meetings and school-based activities that brought in members of the community (i.e., Career Day, Read Across America, Pizza with the Police).

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?

One challenge during the implementation process was the limited number of staff members who could effectively implement Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) for the primary and intermediate grade levels. Leveled Literacy Intervention was utilized in Grades 1 and 2 only for select students. If additional teachers were offered training through the district, LLI could be implemented in Grades 3-5, and with additional groups of students in Grades 1-2.

Another challenge was the limited number of basic skills interventionists in the intermediate grades. There was only one ELL teacher and one BSI teacher to service all of the classrooms in Grades 3-5. Further, two of the BSI teachers who serviced the primary grades (K-2) were out on maternity leave for several months of the year.

Lastly, another challenge was the limited visibility of a math coach in the building. Our math coach services two buildings, and spends most of her time at her other location (New York Avenue) due to need. Teachers expressed an interest in receiving more math coaching and more professional development in math. Teachers did not receive all of their scheduled professional development for math.

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?

The strengths of program implementation were the school-wide use of data to inform instruction, and the heavy emphasis on teacher professional development and training in the literacy collaborative framework and best practices in literacy. Both primary and intermediate teachers were also coached on a monthly basis with a trained literacy coordinator. This allowed teachers the opportunity to reflect on their practice and refine instruction to best meet the needs of their students.

As mentioned in the previous section, a weakness in the program's implementation was a limited number of available basic skills interventionists, and particularly teachers trained in Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI).

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?

In order to encourage more parental involvement, consistent monthly PAC meetings were held with a variety of speakers, as well as additional parent workshops. Further, many activities were planned school-wide that promoted the active involvement of local community members. Some of these activities were Back to School Night, Career Day, Pizza with Police, Winter Show, Spring Show, Award Ceremonies, and Read Across America.

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?

The perceptions of the staff were measured using several surveys – Staff After School Program Survey, Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey, Staff Satisfaction Survey, and School Climate Survey. The purpose of the Staff After School Program Survey was to obtain feedback about the After School Program from staff in order to improve future After School Programs. The purpose of the Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey was to obtain feedback from instructional staff designed to: improve the effectiveness of instruction at all grade levels, in order to ensure that students are college and career ready; and to make ongoing and future decisions about teaching and learning practices. The purpose of the Student, Instructional Staff and Parent (Satisfaction) Surveys were to obtain feedback from students, instructional staff and parents on the importance, and level of *satisfaction* with school services, and to use their perceptions to make school improvements. The purpose of the School Climate Inventory (SCI) was to obtain feedback from school staff on school climate, a variable highly correlated with school effectiveness and student achievement, and to develop strategies to address climate factors that may inhibit or limit school effectiveness and student achievement.

The Implementation and Impact of Instructional Practices Survey results indicated that teachers recognize the positive impact of the literacy framework, professional development sessions in literacy, and classroom coaching in literacy instruction. Teachers view the math curriculum favorably, but desire more professional development in math and more math coaching.

The School Climate Inventory Survey results indicated 100 percent of teachers strongly agree or agree that students are expected to: resolve conflicts peacefully, instructional methods respect different student learning styles, content and performance standards guide the learning activities that teachers choose, students of different social and cultural backgrounds behave positively towards one another, faculty and staff cooperate a great deal to achieve school goals, teachers are proud of this school and its students, students are expected to achieve at high levels, and student behavior is generally positive.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Areas with the most improvement over the past year included: parents are invited to serve on school advisory committees, teachers, administrators, and parents assume joint responsibility for student discipline, faculty and staff cooperate a great deal in trying to achieve school goals, and the school's principal is fair and consistent in addressing disciplinary issues.

Results from the other surveys will be available in June.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?

Perceptions of the community were measured using the Parent/Guardian After School Program Survey and Parent Satisfaction Survey. The purpose of Staff After School Program Survey was to obtain feedback about the After School Program from staff in order to improve future After School Programs. In addition, parents/guardians were asked to rate the services provided by the Title I Parent Resource Centers. The purpose of the Parent Satisfaction survey was to obtain feedback from students, instructional staff and parents on the importance, and level of *satisfaction* with school services, and to use their perceptions to make school improvements. The parent survey was available in both English and Spanish.

Results from the surveys will be available in June.

8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?

Program/Intervention	Method of Delivery	Grade Level(s)
Literacy Collaborative Framework	Small/Whole Group Sessions	K-5
Reading Recovery	One on One	1
Leveled Literacy Intervention	Small Group Session	1-2
English as a Second Language (ESL)	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5
Title I Basic Skills Instruction	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5
Afterschool Program	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5
Summer School	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5
Supplemental Education Services Program	Small Group Session	1,3

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

Beyond the Bell Afterschool Program	Small/Whole Group Sessions	2
-------------------------------------	----------------------------	---

9. How did the school structure the interventions?

Program/Intervention	Method of Delivery	Grade Level(s)	Structure of Intervention
Literacy Collaborative Framework	Small/Whole Group Sessions	K-5	In class – all students
Reading Recovery	One on One	1	Pull out one on one instruction based on results on various reading assessments
Leveled Literacy Intervention	Small Group Session	1-2	Pull out small group instruction based on results on various reading assessments
English as a Second Language (ESL)	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	In class – based on WIDA results and ELL classification
Title I Basic Skills Instruction	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	In class – based on results on various assessments
Afterschool Program	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	In class after normal school hours 3 times weekly – all students eligible
Summer School	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	In class – half day sessions for one month, 4 days weekly – all students eligible
Supplemental Educational Services Program	Small Group Session	1,3	In class after normal school hours - 2-4 hours weekly for one month
Beyond the Bell Afterschool Program	Small/Whole Group Sessions	2	In class after normal school hours – 3 times weekly from Oct.-April – for ELL

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

			students
--	--	--	----------

10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

Program/Intervention	Method of Delivery	Grade Level(s)	Frequency of Instruction
Literacy Collaborative Framework	Small/Whole Group Sessions	K-5	Daily
Reading Recovery	One on One	1	Daily
Leveled Literacy Intervention	Small Group Session	1-2	Daily
English as a Second Language (ESL)	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	Daily
Title I Basic Skills Instruction	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	Daily
Afterschool Program	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	3 times weekly afterschool for 1.5 hours
Summer School	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	4 days weekly for one month – half day sessions
Supplemental Educational Services Program	Small Group Session	1,3	2-4 hours weekly for one month
Beyond the Bell Afterschool Program	Small/Whole Group Sessions	2	3 times weekly afterschool for 1.5 hours - Oct.-April

11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?

Program/Intervention	Method of Delivery	Grade Level(s)	Technology
Literacy Collaborative Framework	Small/Whole Group Sessions	K-5	Chromebooks, Elmo Projector, Classroom Desktop Computer, Teacher Laptop
Reading Recovery	One on One	1	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Level Literacy Intervention	Small Group Session	1-2	N/A
English as a Second Language (ESL)	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	Chromebooks, Elmo Projector, Projector, Classroom Desktop Computer, Teacher Laptop
Title I Basic Skills Instruction	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	Chromebooks, Elmo Projector, Projector, Classroom Desktop Computer, Teacher Laptop
Afterschool Program	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	Chromebooks, Elmo Projector, Projector, Classroom Desktop Computer
Summer School	Small/Whole Group Session	K-5	Chromebooks, Elmo Projector, Projector, Classroom Desktop Computer, Teacher Laptop
Supplemental Educational Services Program	Small Group Session	1,3	Chromebooks, Elmo Projector, Projector, Classroom Desktop Computer, Teacher Laptop
Beyond the Bell Afterschool Program	Small/Whole Group Session	2	Chromebooks, Elmo Projector, Projector, Classroom Desktop Computer, Teacher Laptop, The Writer Learning Systems/Forte

12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

Technology did contribute to the success of the program. The Chromebooks were used regularly in both primary and intermediate classrooms. Primary teachers utilized the Chromebooks as part of their literacy centers, while intermediate teachers used them for composing writing pieces, publishing writing, researching, Reader's Notebooks letters, PARCC testing, and project-based learning. The

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Elmo projector and teacher laptop were utilized for instruction daily in all subject areas. The projector and teacher laptop were used for parent workshops, professional development sessions for teachers, and as an instructional tool on a daily basis in all subject areas.

**Provide a separate response for each question.*

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance

State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	N/A (School opened for its first year in 2013-2014)	N/A (Results for PARCC not received yet)	Literacy Collaborative, Guided Reading, Guided Writing, Individual Conferencing, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, ESL Services, Afterschool Program, Summer School	N/A
Grade 5	N/A (School opened for its first year in 2013-2014)	N/A (Results for PARCC not received yet)	Literacy Collaborative, Guided Reading, Guided Writing, Individual Conferencing, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, ESL Services, Afterschool Program, Summer School	N/A

Mathematics	2013-2014	2014-2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Grade 4	N/A (School opened for its	N/A (Results for PARCC not	5E Mathematics Model, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, Small Intervention Groups in Math, Afterschool Program, Summer School	N/A

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

	first year in 2013-2014)	received yet)		
Grade 5	N/A (School opened for its first year in 2013-2014)	N/A (Results for PARCC not received yet)	5E Mathematics Model, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, Small Intervention Groups in Math, Afterschool Program, Summer School	N/A

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance *Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)*

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

English Language Arts	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions <i>did</i> or <i>did not</i> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Kindergarten	32 out of 69	Results not available yet	Literacy Collaborative, Guided Reading, Conferring, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, ESL Services, Afterschool Program, Summer School	The Literacy Collaborative Framework (including guided reading and conferring) allowed students to receive differentiated instruction via flexible groups and small group instruction. Basic Skills and ESL teachers provided additional small group instruction. Additional interventions included the Afterschool Program and Summer School, which were both offered to all students. Results on various assessments collected via district PPMCC sheets showed consistent gains for most students receiving interventions. Students who did not achieve proficiency were at beginning stages of language acquisition, chose not to participate in the additional interventions of Summer School or the Afterschool Program, had inconsistent attendance, or were retained or referred to the Intervention and Referral Services team for further consideration.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

Grade 1	31 out of 68	Results not available yet	Literacy Collaborative, Reading Recovery, Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Guided Reading, Conferring, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, ESL Services, Afterschool Program, Summer School	The Literacy Collaborative Framework (including guided reading and conferring) allowed students to receive differentiated instruction via flexible groups and small group instruction. Basic Skills and ESL teachers provided additional small group instruction. Reading Recovery was offered to select Grade 1 students, and Leveled Literacy Intervention was offered to select Grade 1 and 2 students. Additional interventions included the Afterschool Program and Summer School, which were both offered to all students. Results on various assessments collected via district PPMCC sheets showed consistent gains for most students receiving interventions. Data collected specifically for Reading Recovery and Leveled Literacy Intervention students showed significant gains for these students. Students who did not achieve proficiency were at beginning stages of language acquisition, chose not to participate in the additional interventions of Summer School or the Afterschool Program, had inconsistent attendance, or were retained or referred to the Intervention and Referral Services team for further consideration.
Grade 2	32 out of 62	Results not available yet	Literacy Collaborative, Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Guided Reading, Conferring, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, ESL Services, Afterschool Program, Summer School	The Literacy Collaborative Framework (including guided reading and conferring) allowed students to receive differentiated instruction via flexible groups and small group instruction. Basic Skills and ESL teachers provided additional small group instruction. Additional interventions included the Afterschool Program and Summer School, which were both offered to all students. Results on various assessments collected via district PPMCC sheets showed consistent gains for most students receiving interventions. Data collected specifically for Leveled Literacy Intervention students showed significant gains for these students. Students who did not achieve proficiency were at beginning stages of language acquisition, chose not to participate

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

				in the additional interventions of Summer School or the Afterschool Program, had inconsistent attendance, or were retained or referred to the Intervention and Referral Services team for further consideration.
--	--	--	--	--

Mathematics	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	Interventions Provided	Describe why the interventions provided <u>did or did not</u> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention).
Kindergarten	10	N/A	5E Mathematics Model, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, Small Intervention Groups in Math, Afterschool Program, Summer School	The 5E Mathematics Model and small intervention groups in Math were offered to all students. Title I/Basic Skills teachers offered additional remediation in math for select classrooms. Additional interventions included the Afterschool Program and Summer School, which were both offered to all students. Data collected via math fluency assessments and benchmark tests showed gains pre to post assessment. Students who did not achieve proficiency were at beginning stages of language acquisition, had low math fluency and/or benchmark scores, chose not to participate in the additional interventions of Summer School or the Afterschool Program, had inconsistent attendance, or were retained or referred to the Intervention and Referral Services team for further consideration.
Grade 1	14	N/A	5E Mathematics Model, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, Small Intervention Groups in Math, Afterschool Program, Summer School	The 5E Mathematics Model and small intervention groups in Math were offered to all students. Title I/Basic Skills teachers offered additional remediation in math for select classrooms. Additional interventions included the Afterschool Program and Summer School, which were both offered to all students. Data collected via math fluency assessments and benchmark tests showed gains pre to post assessment. Students who did not achieve proficiency were at beginning stages of language acquisition, had low math fluency and/or benchmark scores, chose not to participate in the additional interventions of Summer School or the Afterschool Program, had inconsistent attendance, or

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

				were retained or referred to the Intervention and Referral Services team for further consideration.
Grade 2	9	N/A	5E Mathematics Model, Basic Skills/Title I Instruction, Small Intervention Groups in Math, Afterschool Program, Summer School	The 5E Mathematics Model and small intervention groups in Math were offered to all students. Title I/Basic Skills teachers offered additional remediation in math for select classrooms. Additional interventions included the Afterschool Program and Summer School, which were both offered to all students. Data collected via math fluency assessments and benchmark tests showed gains pre to post assessment. Students who did not achieve proficiency were at beginning stages of language acquisition, had low math fluency and/or benchmark scores, chose not to participate in the additional interventions of Summer School or the Afterschool Program, had inconsistent attendance, or were retained or referred to the Intervention and Referral Services team for further consideration.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Interventions to Increase Student Achievement – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)																																																												
ELA	All Students in Grades 3-5	Literacy Collaborative Framework	Yes	The Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) is a reading assessment program that provides data on students’ reading levels and growth over time. Students who score advanced or proficient are considered to be reading at or above grade level. The SRI was administered three times over the course of the year (September, January, and May). Classroom teachers and administrators examined student growth	<p>The data indicates growth over time (September to May) in Language Arts Literacy for students in grades 3-5 on the SRI Assessment.</p> <p>SRI Results for the 2014-2015 School Year: Proficiency Growth Report</p> <table><tr><th colspan="3">September</th><th colspan="2">May</th></tr><tr><th colspan="5">SRI Results - Grade 3</th></tr><tr><td>Performance Standard</td><td>Students</td><td>Percentage of Students</td><td>Students</td><td>Percentage of Students</td></tr><tr><td>Advanced</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td><td>3</td><td>5%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>11</td><td>17%</td><td>20</td><td>31%</td></tr><tr><td>Basic</td><td>13</td><td>21%</td><td>25</td><td>39%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Basic</td><td>39</td><td>62%</td><td>16</td><td>25%</td></tr></table> <p></p> <table><tr><th colspan="3">September</th><th colspan="2">May</th></tr><tr><th colspan="5">SRI Results - Grade 4</th></tr><tr><td>Performance Standard</td><td>Students</td><td>Percentage of Students</td><td>Students</td><td>Percentage of Students</td></tr><tr><td>Advanced</td><td>2</td><td>4%</td><td>7</td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>10</td><td>22%</td><td>13</td><td>28%</td></tr></table>	September			May		SRI Results - Grade 3					Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students	Advanced	0	0%	3	5%	Proficient	11	17%	20	31%	Basic	13	21%	25	39%	Below Basic	39	62%	16	25%	September			May		SRI Results - Grade 4					Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students	Advanced	2	4%	7	15%	Proficient	10	22%	13	28%
September			May																																																														
SRI Results - Grade 3																																																																	
Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students																																																													
Advanced	0	0%	3	5%																																																													
Proficient	11	17%	20	31%																																																													
Basic	13	21%	25	39%																																																													
Below Basic	39	62%	16	25%																																																													
September			May																																																														
SRI Results - Grade 4																																																																	
Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students																																																													
Advanced	2	4%	7	15%																																																													
Proficient	10	22%	13	28%																																																													

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)														
				and proficiency, and teachers used this assessment tool to set their Student Growth Objectives (SGOs). The NJ School Performance Report based on NJASK results in the areas of Academic Achievement, College and Career Readiness, and Student Growth.	<table><tr><td>Basic</td><td>3</td><td>7%</td><td>19</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Basic</td><td>30</td><td>67%</td><td>8</td><td>17%</td></tr></table>					Basic	3	7%	19	40%	Below Basic	30	67%	8	17%
					Basic	3	7%	19	40%										
					Below Basic	30	67%	8	17%										
					September			May											
					SRI Results - Grade 5														
					Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students										
					Advanced	4	9%	7	14%										
					Proficient	6	13%	24	48%										
					Basic	22	47%	12	24%										
					Below Basic	15	32%	7	14%										
					The data indicates that the academic performance of the school significantly lags in comparison to schools across the state. Yet, its academic performance is high when compared to its peers. The school’s college and career readiness is about average when compared to school across the state, but high when compared to its peers. Last, the school’s student growth performance lags in comparison to schools across the state, but is about average when compared to its peers.														

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)																										
					<div>NJ School Performance Report – 2013-2014</div> <table><tr><th>Performance Areas</th><th>Peer Percentile</th><th>Statewide Percentile</th><th>Percent of Targets Met</th></tr><tr><td>Academic Achievement</td><td>70</td><td>14</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>College and Career Readiness</td><td>74</td><td>40</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Student Growth</td><td>56</td><td>35</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <p>The data below indicates that 42% of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient or above in Language Arts Literacy. Further, the school has a proficiency rate that is 75% higher than its peer schools in Language Arts Literacy, but only 11% compared to schools statewide.</p> <div>NJ School Performance Report – 2013-2014</div> <table><tr><th>Academic Achievement Indicators</th><th>Schoolwide Performance</th><th>Peer Percentile</th><th>State Percentile</th><th>Percent of Targets Met</th></tr><tr><td>NJ ASK Language Arts Proficiency and Above</td><td>42%</td><td>75</td><td>11</td><td>N/A</td></tr></table>	Performance Areas	Peer Percentile	Statewide Percentile	Percent of Targets Met	Academic Achievement	70	14	N/A	College and Career Readiness	74	40	0%	Student Growth	56	35	100%	Academic Achievement Indicators	Schoolwide Performance	Peer Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Targets Met	NJ ASK Language Arts Proficiency and Above	42%	75	11	N/A
Performance Areas	Peer Percentile	Statewide Percentile	Percent of Targets Met																												
Academic Achievement	70	14	N/A																												
College and Career Readiness	74	40	0%																												
Student Growth	56	35	100%																												
Academic Achievement Indicators	Schoolwide Performance	Peer Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Targets Met																											
NJ ASK Language Arts Proficiency and Above	42%	75	11	N/A																											

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)																								
ELA	ELL	Literacy Collaborative Framework, Rigby: Language Development, Guided Reading	Yes	WIDA ACCESS 2014 NJ ASK 2014	<p>Fully English language proficient (ELP) students demonstrate proficient reading, writing, and comprehension abilities of academic English and other academic areas.</p> <p>Students who attain a composite score of 6.0 on the ACCESS for ELLs test achieve an ELP 6 Language Level and are no longer classified as an English Language Learner.</p> <p>The district is required to monitor all fully English language proficient students for the first two school years after they exit from ELL/LEP classification.</p> <p>The students who exited the program in 2014 were placed in general education classrooms, due to the limited numbers of ESL teachers.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">WIDA ACCESS 2014 Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Oral Language, Literacy, and Comprehension Exited the ESL Program based on the ACCESS for ELLs test</p> <table><tr><th>Grade Level 2014-15 School Year</th><th>Students with F1 LEP status</th><th>Students in Grade Level</th><th>Percentage of Students with F1 LEP Status</th></tr><tr><td>First Grade</td><td>8</td><td>66</td><td>12.12%</td></tr><tr><td>Second Grade</td><td>7</td><td>73</td><td>9.58%</td></tr><tr><td>Third Grade</td><td>9</td><td>63</td><td>14.28%</td></tr><tr><td>Fourth Grade</td><td>12</td><td>46</td><td>26.08%</td></tr><tr><td>Fifth Grade</td><td>3</td><td>50</td><td>6%</td></tr></table>	Grade Level 2014-15 School Year	Students with F1 LEP status	Students in Grade Level	Percentage of Students with F1 LEP Status	First Grade	8	66	12.12%	Second Grade	7	73	9.58%	Third Grade	9	63	14.28%	Fourth Grade	12	46	26.08%	Fifth Grade	3	50	6%
Grade Level 2014-15 School Year	Students with F1 LEP status	Students in Grade Level	Percentage of Students with F1 LEP Status																										
First Grade	8	66	12.12%																										
Second Grade	7	73	9.58%																										
Third Grade	9	63	14.28%																										
Fourth Grade	12	46	26.08%																										
Fifth Grade	3	50	6%																										

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)																																																															
ELA	ELA- Grades 1 and 2 (selected students)	Leveled Literacy Intervention	Yes	Level Literacy Data – Guided Reading Levels, Fluency Scores	<div>First Round Leveled Literacy Intervention Group Data</div> <table><tr><th>Grade Level</th><th>Average Guided Reading Level Growth (Sept.-Feb.)</th></tr><tr><td>First</td><td>3 Levels</td></tr><tr><td>Second</td><td>4 Levels</td></tr></table>	Grade Level	Average Guided Reading Level Growth (Sept.-Feb.)	First	3 Levels	Second	4 Levels																																																									
Grade Level	Average Guided Reading Level Growth (Sept.-Feb.)																																																																			
First	3 Levels																																																																			
Second	4 Levels																																																																			
ELA	ELA – Grade 1 (selected students)	Reading Recovery	Yes	Reading Recovery Data – Letter ID, Concepts About Print, Word Reading, Reading Level, Writing Vocabulary, Hearing Sounds in Words	<div>Reading Recovery Data Round One (September-February)</div> <table><tr><th>Student</th><th>Letter ID – Sept.</th><th>Letter ID - Feb.</th><th>Concepts About Print – Sept.</th><th>Concepts About Print – Feb.</th><th>Word Reading – Sept.</th><th>Word Reading – Feb.</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>23</td><td>48</td><td>8</td><td>19</td><td>1</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>50</td><td>52</td><td>10</td><td>21</td><td>2</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>29</td><td>50</td><td>12</td><td>17</td><td>1</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>46</td><td>5</td><td>11</td><td>1</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>26</td><td>49</td><td>9</td><td>13</td><td>2</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>50</td><td>54</td><td>6</td><td>6</td><td>5</td><td>11</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>23</td><td>52</td><td>10</td><td>13</td><td>2</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>52</td><td>54</td><td>11</td><td>14</td><td>4</td><td>17</td></tr></table>	Student	Letter ID – Sept.	Letter ID - Feb.	Concepts About Print – Sept.	Concepts About Print – Feb.	Word Reading – Sept.	Word Reading – Feb.	1	23	48	8	19	1	14	2	50	52	10	21	2	12	3	29	50	12	17	1	7	4	6	46	5	11	1	5	5	26	49	9	13	2	15	6	50	54	6	6	5	11	7	23	52	10	13	2	15	8	52	54	11	14	4	17
Student	Letter ID – Sept.	Letter ID - Feb.	Concepts About Print – Sept.	Concepts About Print – Feb.	Word Reading – Sept.	Word Reading – Feb.																																																														
1	23	48	8	19	1	14																																																														
2	50	52	10	21	2	12																																																														
3	29	50	12	17	1	7																																																														
4	6	46	5	11	1	5																																																														
5	26	49	9	13	2	15																																																														
6	50	54	6	6	5	11																																																														
7	23	52	10	13	2	15																																																														
8	52	54	11	14	4	17																																																														

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)																																																															
					<div>Reading Recovery Data Round One (September-February)</div> <table><tr><th>Student</th><th>Reading Level – Sept.</th><th>Reading Level - Feb.</th><th>Writing Vocab – Sept.</th><th>Writing Vocab – Feb.</th><th>Hearing Sounds in Words– Sept.</th><th>Hearing Sounds in Words – Feb.</th></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>4</td><td>32</td><td>2</td><td>35</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>13</td><td>50</td><td>5</td><td>37</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>0</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>19</td><td>1</td><td>25</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>0</td><td>3</td><td>0</td><td>23</td><td>0</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>11</td><td>44</td><td>5</td><td>35</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>12</td><td>34</td><td>9</td><td>34</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>37</td><td>4</td><td>31</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>21</td><td>70</td><td>24</td><td>37</td></tr></table>	Student	Reading Level – Sept.	Reading Level - Feb.	Writing Vocab – Sept.	Writing Vocab – Feb.	Hearing Sounds in Words– Sept.	Hearing Sounds in Words – Feb.	1	0	5	4	32	2	35	2	0	5	13	50	5	37	3	0	3	3	19	1	25	4	0	3	0	23	0	18	5	0	5	11	44	5	35	6	0	1	12	34	9	34	7	0	5	6	37	4	31	8	0	5	21	70	24	37
Student	Reading Level – Sept.	Reading Level - Feb.	Writing Vocab – Sept.	Writing Vocab – Feb.	Hearing Sounds in Words– Sept.	Hearing Sounds in Words – Feb.																																																														
1	0	5	4	32	2	35																																																														
2	0	5	13	50	5	37																																																														
3	0	3	3	19	1	25																																																														
4	0	3	0	23	0	18																																																														
5	0	5	11	44	5	35																																																														
6	0	1	12	34	9	34																																																														
7	0	5	6	37	4	31																																																														
8	0	5	21	70	24	37																																																														
Math	All Students in Grades 3-5	5E Mathematics Program: Engagement Exploration Explanation Elaboration Evaluation	Yes	Quarterly Mathematics Benchmark Quarterly Math Facts Fluency Assessment	<div>The data indicates growth over time on all three benchmark assessments in math across all grade levels (3-5).</div> <table><tr><th colspan="3">Benchmark 1 Assessment: Number Sense and Operations</th></tr><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Pretest</th><th>Posttest</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>45%</td><td>53%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>42%</td><td>56%</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>32%</td><td>59%</td></tr></table>	Benchmark 1 Assessment: Number Sense and Operations			Grade	Pretest	Posttest	3	45%	53%	4	42%	56%	5	32%	59%																																																
Benchmark 1 Assessment: Number Sense and Operations																																																																				
Grade	Pretest	Posttest																																																																		
3	45%	53%																																																																		
4	42%	56%																																																																		
5	32%	59%																																																																		

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)																																													
					<table><tr><th colspan="3">Benchmark 2 Assessment: Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Math</th></tr><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Pretest</th><th>Posttest</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>24%</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>28%</td><td>53%</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>25%</td><td>51%</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="3">Benchmark 3 Assessment: Geometry and Measurement</th></tr><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Pretest</th><th>Posttest</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>34%</td><td>71%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>36%</td><td>52%</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>24%</td><td>50%</td></tr></table> <p>The data indicates growth in fluency assessment averages over time across all grade levels (3-5)</p> <table><tr><th colspan="3">Math Fluency Assessment Averages (Out of 32 Possible)</th></tr><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Fluency 1 - September</th><th>Fluency 3 - March</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>19</td><td>28</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>10</td><td>22</td></tr></table>	Benchmark 2 Assessment: Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Math			Grade	Pretest	Posttest	3	24%	50%	4	28%	53%	5	25%	51%	Benchmark 3 Assessment: Geometry and Measurement			Grade	Pretest	Posttest	3	34%	71%	4	36%	52%	5	24%	50%	Math Fluency Assessment Averages (Out of 32 Possible)			Grade	Fluency 1 - September	Fluency 3 - March	3	1	20	4	19	28	5	10	22
Benchmark 2 Assessment: Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Math																																																		
Grade	Pretest	Posttest																																																
3	24%	50%																																																
4	28%	53%																																																
5	25%	51%																																																
Benchmark 3 Assessment: Geometry and Measurement																																																		
Grade	Pretest	Posttest																																																
3	34%	71%																																																
4	36%	52%																																																
5	24%	50%																																																
Math Fluency Assessment Averages (Out of 32 Possible)																																																		
Grade	Fluency 1 - September	Fluency 3 - March																																																
3	1	20																																																
4	19	28																																																
5	10	22																																																

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)																
					<p>The data indicates that the academic performance of the school significantly lags in comparison to schools across the state. Yet, its academic performance is high when compared to its peers. The school’s college and career readiness is about average when compared to school across the state, but high when compared to its peers. Last, the school’s student growth performance lags in comparison to schools across the state, but is about average when compared to its peers.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">NJ School Performance Report – 2013-2014</p> <table><tr><th>Performance Areas</th><th>Peer Percentile</th><th>Statewide Percentile</th><th>Percent of Targets Met</th></tr><tr><td>Academic Achievement</td><td>70</td><td>14</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>College and Career Readiness</td><td>74</td><td>40</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Student Growth</td><td>56</td><td>35</td><td>100%</td></tr></table> <p>The data below indicates that 65% of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient or above in Math. Further, the school has a proficiency rate that is 65% higher than its peer schools in Math, but only 16% compared to schools statewide.</p>	Performance Areas	Peer Percentile	Statewide Percentile	Percent of Targets Met	Academic Achievement	70	14	N/A	College and Career Readiness	74	40	0%	Student Growth	56	35	100%
Performance Areas	Peer Percentile	Statewide Percentile	Percent of Targets Met																		
Academic Achievement	70	14	N/A																		
College and Career Readiness	74	40	0%																		
Student Growth	56	35	100%																		

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)										
					<div>NJ School Performance Report – 2013-2014</div> <table><tr><th>Academic Achievement Indicators</th><th>Schoolwide Performance</th><th>Peer Percentile</th><th>State Percentile</th><th>Percent of Targets Met</th></tr><tr><td>NJ ASK Math Proficiency and Above</td><td>65%</td><td>65</td><td>16</td><td>N/A</td></tr></table>	Academic Achievement Indicators	Schoolwide Performance	Peer Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Targets Met	NJ ASK Math Proficiency and Above	65%	65	16	N/A
Academic Achievement Indicators	Schoolwide Performance	Peer Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Targets Met											
NJ ASK Math Proficiency and Above	65%	65	16	N/A											

Extended Day/Year Interventions – Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Students in Grades K-5 who chose to enroll	Afterschool Title I Academy	Yes	Student Participation Attendance	Examination of district assessment data collected on PPMCC sheets and analyzed by Measurement and Evaluation Associates. At the primary level, letter ID, print concepts, high frequency word assessments – reading and writing, phonics awareness, writing samples, letter sounds, benchmarks, and guided reading levels were examined. At the intermediate level, the Slosson, Schlagal,

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					EPASK, Written Response to Reading, SRI, Benchmarks, and guided reading levels were examined.
Math	Students in Grades K-5 who chose to enroll	Afterschool Title I Academy	Yes	Student Participation Attendance	Examination of benchmark scores (pre and post test) at each grade level, as well as increases in fact fluency scores.
ELA and Math	Sheltered (ELL) students in Grade 2	Beyond the Bell – Title 3	Yes	Student Participation Attendance	For language arts, examination of district assessment data collected on PPMCC sheets and analyzed by Measurement and Evaluation Associates. At the primary level, letter ID, print concepts, high frequency word assessments – reading and writing, phonics awareness, writing samples, letter sounds, benchmarks, and guided reading levels were examined. At the intermediate level, the Slosson, Schlagal, EPASK, Written Response to Reading, SRI, Benchmarks, and guided reading levels were examined. For math, examination of benchmark scores (pre and post test) at each grade level, as well as increases in fact fluency scores.
ELA	Select students with below level guided reading levels in grades 1 and 3	Supplemental Educational Services Tutoring	Yes	Student Participation Attendance Increase in student GR levels	Examination of district assessment data collected on PPMCC sheets and analyzed by Measurement and Evaluation Associates. At the primary level, letter ID, print concepts, high frequency word assessments – reading and writing, phonics awareness, writing samples, letter sounds, benchmarks, and guided reading levels were examined. At the intermediate level, the Slosson, Schlagal, EPASK, Written Response to Reading, SRI,

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					Benchmarks, and guided reading levels were examined.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies

Professional Development – Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
ELA	Teachers of ELA (Grades K-5)	Principal's Meetings on Language Arts Literacy	Yes	<p>Implementation of the literacy collaborative framework</p> <p>Data collected on PPMCC sheets</p> <p>Principal's Evaluations – Formal and Informal</p> <p>Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey</p>	<p>All teachers received professional development through Ongoing Literacy Training (4 hour long sessions, and one 2 hour session).</p> <p>Implementation of the framework was monitored through principal's evaluations, both formal and informal.</p> <p>The purpose of the Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey was to obtain feedback from instructional staff designed to: improve the effectiveness of instruction at all grade levels, in order to ensure that students are college and career ready; and to make ongoing and future decisions about teaching and learning practices.</p> <p>Survey respondents were asked to rate the literacy instructional program in the following areas: professional development; classroom coaching; literacy coach(s); frequency of use of the literacy framework/curriculum; their skill at teaching the literacy framework/curriculum; impact of the literacy framework/curriculum on student literacy skills and motivation; and use of data received from the Fountas and Pinell</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)															
					<p>benchmark assessment. In addition, respondents were asked for feedback on: the LoTi Walk-Thru Look-Fors; positive comments; suggestion for improvement; and program challenges.</p> <p>Survey respondents were also asked to rate the mathematics instructional program on a range of areas similar to those for the literacy program.</p> <p>The Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey revealed the following:</p> <p>Sessions Led by Literacy Coach: Amount of Impact</p> <table><tr><th>Area</th><th>A Lot</th><th>Some</th><th>A Little</th><th>No</th></tr><tr><td>Impact on Teaching</td><td>51%</td><td>34%</td><td>7%</td><td>7%</td></tr><tr><td>Ability to Understand Students</td><td>46%</td><td>32%</td><td>7%</td><td>15%</td></tr></table> <p>Further, district assessment data was collected and examined on PPMCC sheets and analyzed by Measurement and Evaluation Associates. At the primary level,</p>	Area	A Lot	Some	A Little	No	Impact on Teaching	51%	34%	7%	7%	Ability to Understand Students	46%	32%	7%	15%
Area	A Lot	Some	A Little	No																
Impact on Teaching	51%	34%	7%	7%																
Ability to Understand Students	46%	32%	7%	15%																

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)															
					letter ID, print concepts, high frequency word assessments – reading and writing, phonics awareness, writing samples, letter sounds, benchmarks, and guided reading levels were examined. At the intermediate level, the Slosson, Schlagal, EPASK, Written Response to Reading, SRI, Benchmarks, and guided reading levels were examined.															
ELA	Teachers of ELA (Grades K-5)	Literacy Collaborative - Coaching	Yes	Implementation of the literacy collaborative framework Coaching Sessions Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey Principal’s Evaluations – Formal and Informal	<p>Teachers received regularly scheduled coaching sessions 1-2 times monthly with a trained Literacy Coordinator (primary or intermediate). The coaching sessions mirrored the calendar for Initial Training in the Literacy Collaborative Framework, and were also based on the needs of the teachers.</p> <p>The Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey revealed the following:</p> <p>Classroom Coaching by Literacy Coach: Amount of Impact</p> <table><tr><th>Area</th><th>A Lot</th><th>Some</th><th>A Little</th><th>No</th></tr><tr><td>Impact on Teaching</td><td>46%</td><td>32%</td><td>7%</td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>Ability to</td><td>40%</td><td>43%</td><td>5%</td><td>13%</td></tr></table>	Area	A Lot	Some	A Little	No	Impact on Teaching	46%	32%	7%	15%	Ability to	40%	43%	5%	13%
Area	A Lot	Some	A Little	No																
Impact on Teaching	46%	32%	7%	15%																
Ability to	40%	43%	5%	13%																

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)																			
					Understand Students																			
Math	Teachers of Math (Grades K-5)	Principal’s Meetings on Math	No	Mathematics Benchmark Assessments Fact Fluency Assessments Implementation of 5E Mathematical Program Principal’s Evaluations – Formal and Informal Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey	There was one hour long Principal’s Meeting on Math during the year. Implementation of the math program was monitored through principal’s evaluations, both formal and informal. The Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey revealed the following: Sessions Led by Math Coach: Amount of Impact <table><tr><th>Area</th><th>A Lot</th><th>Some</th><th>A Little</th><th>No</th></tr><tr><td>Impact on Teaching</td><td>16%</td><td>22%</td><td>19%</td><td>44%</td></tr><tr><td>Ability to Understand Students</td><td>13%</td><td>34%</td><td>13%</td><td>41%</td></tr></table>					Area	A Lot	Some	A Little	No	Impact on Teaching	16%	22%	19%	44%	Ability to Understand Students	13%	34%	13%	41%
Area	A Lot	Some	A Little	No																				
Impact on Teaching	16%	22%	19%	44%																				
Ability to Understand Students	13%	34%	13%	41%																				

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)															
					<div>Classroom Coaching by Math Coach: Amount of Impact</div> <table><tr><th>Area</th><th>A Lot</th><th>Some</th><th>A Little</th><th>No</th></tr><tr><td>Impact on Teaching</td><td>7%</td><td>27%</td><td>10%</td><td>57%</td></tr><tr><td>Ability to Understand Students</td><td>6%</td><td>32%</td><td>3%</td><td>58%</td></tr></table> <div>The higher numbers for “no impact” may be due to the math coach being positioned in another school. Teachers only received one professional development session in math, and limited coaching. Teachers expressed interest in receiving more professional development in math and more coaching in the future.</div>	Area	A Lot	Some	A Little	No	Impact on Teaching	7%	27%	10%	57%	Ability to Understand Students	6%	32%	3%	58%
Area	A Lot	Some	A Little	No																
Impact on Teaching	7%	27%	10%	57%																
Ability to Understand Students	6%	32%	3%	58%																
All Areas	Teachers (Grades K-5)	Grade Level Meetings	Yes	Participation Implementation of instructional strategies in various content areas Examination and use of data Principal’s Evaluations – Formal and Informal	Grade-level meetings were scheduled weekly (once per month as a grade level, once with administrators, and once with literacy coaches) in order to examine data, plan and implement instructional strategies in various content areas, and plan miscellaneous activities. Minutes, sign-in sheets, and agendas were kept for each meeting, and sent to the administrators.															

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
All Areas	Teachers (Grades K-5)	School-Wide Committee Meetings	Yes	Participation Design and implementation of school-wide activities	<p>School-wide committee meetings were held once per month after school for one hour, and additional meetings were held as needed. All teachers participated in one committee. The committees were: School Leadership Team and I & RS, School Improvement Panel, School Spirit/Cheer Fund, School Safety Committee/Critical Response/HIB/Suicide, and Public Relations Committee.</p> <p>Administrators kept minutes, sign-in sheets, and agendas for each meeting.</p>
All Areas	Teachers (Grades K-5)	School-Wide Faculty Meetings	Yes	Participation Implementation of instructional strategies in various content areas Examination and use of data Principal's Evaluations – Formal and Informal	<p>School-wide faculty meetings were held once per month after school. All teachers attended. Various school business was discussed including: general school information and procedures, discussion of data, examination of research based best practices, and reports from guidance, literacy coaches, technology coordinator, media specialist, and school nurse.</p> <p>Administrators kept minutes, sign-in sheets, and agendas for each meeting.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)

Family and Community Engagement Implemented in 2014-2015

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
All Content Areas	Parents of All Students	Back to School Night	Yes	Sign-In Sheet/Attendance Parental Involvement	186 of our parents attended the 2014-2015 Back to School Night.
All Content Areas	Parents of All Students	Parent Workshops/PAC Meetings	Yes	Sign-In Sheet/Attendance Participation	Several workshops were offered for parents during the year. Topics included: Fire Safety, Anxious Children, Mammography, Health Insurance, Literacy Focus, PARCC, and Donuts with Daddy. Also, monthly PAC meetings were held with parents, where various topics were discussed.
All Content Areas	Parents of All Students	Parent-Teacher Conferences	Yes	Sign-In Sheet/Attendance Parent Involvement	Parent Teacher Conferences were attended by 90% of parents. A Parent Teacher Conference provided the opportunity for a parent and teacher to discuss the child's progress, examine areas of strength and concern, and work together for the future success of the child.
All Content Areas	Parents of All Students	Awards Assemblies	Yes	Attendance Participation	Awards Assemblies were conducted at the conclusion of each marking period. Students were given academic awards, as well as citizenship awards (for overall effort and behavior).
All Content Areas	Parents of All Students	Kindergarten Parent Student Orientation	Yes	Sign-In Sheet/Attendance Participation	A Kindergarten Parent Student Orientation was conducted in August. School expectations were discussed, tours of the Kindergarten classrooms were given, and

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

1 Content	2 Group	3 Intervention	4 Effective Yes-No	5 Documentation of Effectiveness	6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)
					parents had the opportunity to meet the kindergarten teachers.
All Content Areas	Parents of All Students	Various School-Based Activities	Yes	Sign-In Sheet/Attendance Participation	<p>Various school-based activities were conducted that encouraged participation by both family and community members. Some of the activities were:</p> <p>Career Day</p> <p>Read Across America</p> <p>Pizza with Police</p> <p>Annual Winter and Spring Concerts</p> <p>Multicultural Week</p> <p>Oratorical Contest</p> <p>Spelling Bee</p> <p>Uniform Sale with 4M Fashions for Kids</p> <p>Red Ribbon Week—Anti Drugs, Alcohol, Tobacco & Violence</p> <p>Science Expo</p> <p>Career Day</p> <p>Jump Start Read</p> <p>Blowing Bubbles for Autism</p> <p>Read Across America</p> <p>Book Fair</p> <p>Black History Expo</p> <p>Fun Day</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: EVALUATION *ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(iii)*

Principal's Certification

The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note: Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A scanned copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

☐ I certify that the school's stakeholder/schoolwide committee conducted and completed the required Title I schoolwide evaluation as required for the completion of this Title I Schoolwide Plan. Per this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the identification of all programs and activities that were funded by Title I, Part A.

Principal's Name (Print)

Principal's Signature

Date

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1). "

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Data Collection and Analysis*

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2015-2016

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)					
Academic Achievement – Reading	High Frequency Reading Assessment-Grade 2 NJASK Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) ePASK Reading Performance Benchmark Slosson Schlagal	The High Frequency Reading Assessment-Grade 2 reveals the extent of children’s knowledge of high frequency words, as well as the particular words they know. Their substitutions convey what word parts they notice.					
		High Frequency Reading Assessment-Grade 2 Goal: 250					
			Total Number of Students		September	June	
		School Totals	78	Average	213.4	Available 6/30	
				% of Goal	4%	Available 6/30	
		NJASK reading data from 2014 revealed the following:					
		Grade 3 Reading – NJ ASK Results					
		Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points	% of Total

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)					
		Literature	-9.70%	4.7	4.2	10	42.4%
		Information	-9.23%	9.7	8.8	20	44.0%
		Grade 4 Reading – NJ ASK Results					
		Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points	% of Total
		Literature	-12.47%	6.1	5.3	12	44.5%
		Information	-5.79%	11.6	10.9	24	45.5%
		Grade 5 Reading – NJ ASK Results					
		Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points	% of Total
		Literature	-13.40%	7.6	6.6	14	47.0%
		Information	-11.74%	12.7	11.2	28	40.0%
		<p>The Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) is a reading assessment program that provides data on students' reading levels and growth over time. Students who score advanced or proficient are considered to be reading at or above grade level. The SRI was administered three times over the course</p>					

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																																																																						
		<p>of the year (September, January, and May). Classroom teachers and administrators examined student growth and proficiency, and teachers used this assessment tool to set their Student Growth Objectives (SGOs).</p> <p>SRI Results for the 2014-2015 School Year: Proficiency Growth Report</p> <table><tr><th colspan="3">September</th><th colspan="2">May</th></tr><tr><th colspan="5">SRI Results - Grade 3</th></tr><tr><th>Performance Standard</th><th>Students</th><th>Percentage of Students</th><th>Students</th><th>Percentage of Students</th></tr><tr><td>Advanced</td><td>0</td><td>0%</td><td>3</td><td>5%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>11</td><td>17%</td><td>20</td><td>31%</td></tr><tr><td>Basic</td><td>13</td><td>21%</td><td>25</td><td>39%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Basic</td><td>39</td><td>62%</td><td>16</td><td>25%</td></tr></table> <p></p> <table><tr><th colspan="3">September</th><th colspan="2">May</th></tr><tr><th colspan="5">SRI Results - Grade 4</th></tr><tr><th>Performance Standard</th><th>Students</th><th>Percentage of Students</th><th>Students</th><th>Percentage of Students</th></tr><tr><td>Advanced</td><td>2</td><td>4%</td><td>7</td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>10</td><td>22%</td><td>13</td><td>28%</td></tr><tr><td>Basic</td><td>3</td><td>7%</td><td>19</td><td>40%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Basic</td><td>30</td><td>67%</td><td>8</td><td>17%</td></tr></table>	September			May		SRI Results - Grade 3					Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students	Advanced	0	0%	3	5%	Proficient	11	17%	20	31%	Basic	13	21%	25	39%	Below Basic	39	62%	16	25%	September			May		SRI Results - Grade 4					Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students	Advanced	2	4%	7	15%	Proficient	10	22%	13	28%	Basic	3	7%	19	40%	Below Basic	30	67%	8	17%
September			May																																																																					
SRI Results - Grade 3																																																																								
Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students																																																																				
Advanced	0	0%	3	5%																																																																				
Proficient	11	17%	20	31%																																																																				
Basic	13	21%	25	39%																																																																				
Below Basic	39	62%	16	25%																																																																				
September			May																																																																					
SRI Results - Grade 4																																																																								
Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students																																																																				
Advanced	2	4%	7	15%																																																																				
Proficient	10	22%	13	28%																																																																				
Basic	3	7%	19	40%																																																																				
Below Basic	30	67%	8	17%																																																																				

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																																							
		<table><tr><th colspan="3">September</th><th colspan="2">May</th></tr><tr><th colspan="5">SRI Results - Grade 5</th></tr><tr><th>Performance Standard</th><th>Students</th><th>Percentage of Students</th><th>Students</th><th>Percentage of Students</th></tr><tr><td>Advanced</td><td>4</td><td>9%</td><td>7</td><td>14%</td></tr><tr><td>Proficient</td><td>6</td><td>13%</td><td>24</td><td>48%</td></tr><tr><td>Basic</td><td>22</td><td>47%</td><td>12</td><td>24%</td></tr><tr><td>Below Basic</td><td>15</td><td>32%</td><td>7</td><td>14%</td></tr></table>					September			May		SRI Results - Grade 5					Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students	Advanced	4	9%	7	14%	Proficient	6	13%	24	48%	Basic	22	47%	12	24%	Below Basic	15	32%	7	14%
September			May																																						
SRI Results - Grade 5																																									
Performance Standard	Students	Percentage of Students	Students	Percentage of Students																																					
Advanced	4	9%	7	14%																																					
Proficient	6	13%	24	48%																																					
Basic	22	47%	12	24%																																					
Below Basic	15	32%	7	14%																																					
		<p>The ePASK (developed by Measuring Up corporation) is a formative assessment administered two times during the school year. The results in grades 3-5 revealed the students’ weaknesses and strengths in specific reading skills and strategies connected to the Common Core State Standards. Based upon the results, teachers could focus their reading instruction on meeting student needs in specific reading areas.</p> <p>The Reading Benchmarks developed by Fountas and Pinnell are administered to students in grades 1-5 in September, and Kindergarten students in December. The Benchmark is administered again in March for Kindergarten students, February for students in grades 1-2, and February for a select sampling of students in grades 3-5. The following information is gathered and an instructional level is determined: reading accuracy, reading rate, self-correction ratio, fluency, comprehension, and writing about reading score. Based upon the results, teachers form guided reading groups and individualize their instruction to meet each student’s unique learning needs.</p>																																							

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																			
		<table><tr><th colspan="5">Benchmark Assessment Instructional Reading Level-Grade 2</th></tr><tr><th>Total Number of Students</th><th colspan="2">Beginning of Year</th><th colspan="2">Mid-Year</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="2">78</td><th>Average</th><th>% at or above Level J</th><th>Average</th><th>% at or above Level L</th></tr><tr><td>I</td><td>48%</td><td>K</td><td>55%</td></tr></table> <p>The Slosson is an oral word recognition assessment administered to students in grades 3-5, twice yearly (once in September, and once in June). The assessment provides word lists designed to determine a student’s ability to read words in isolation. Growth percentiles will be examined when the data is collected in June.</p> <p>The Schlagal is a developmental spelling assessment administered in September and June. Classroom teachers analyze the Schlagal results in order to plan Word Study lessons over the course of the year. Growth percentiles will be examined when the data is collected in June.</p> <p>The information collected from all of the above sources is then compiled in a PPMCC sheet (rainbow sheet) for each individual classroom. Management and Evaluation Associates then compile classroom, school, and district percentages.</p>	Benchmark Assessment Instructional Reading Level-Grade 2					Total Number of Students	Beginning of Year		Mid-Year		78	Average	% at or above Level J	Average	% at or above Level L	I	48%	K	55%
Benchmark Assessment Instructional Reading Level-Grade 2																					
Total Number of Students	Beginning of Year		Mid-Year																		
78	Average	% at or above Level J	Average	% at or above Level L																	
	I	48%	K	55%																	
Academic Achievement - Writing	High Frequency Writing Assessment-Grade 2 NJASK Focused Writing Prompt (Grades 3-5)	The High Frequency Writing Assessment-Grade 2 reveals the extent to which a student can spell high frequency words accurately. Attempts at writing may also be noticed, which provides further information about a child’s thinking.																			

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)				
	Unit of Study Writing Prompt	High Frequency Writing-Grade 2				
		Goal: 250				
			Total Number of Students		September	January
		School Totals	78	Average	153.4	199.1
				% of Goal	0%	4%
		NJASK writing data from 2014 revealed the following:				
		Grade 3 Writing – NJ ASK Results				
		Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points
		First Writing Task	-8.54%	4.8	4.4	10
		Second Writing Task	-2.44%	4.9	4.8	10
		Grade 4 Writing – NJ ASK Results				
		Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)					
		First Writing Task	-2.56%	4.6	4.5	10	44.8%
		Second Writing Task	-7.27%	5.7	5.3	10	52.9%
		Grade 5 Writing – NJ ASK Results					
		Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points	% of Total
		First Writing Task	-11.36%	5.3	4.7	10	47.0%
		Second Writing Task	-3.96%	5.4	5.2	10	51.9%
		<p>A Written Response to Reading Prompt is administered to students in September and June through Measuring Up corporation. The prompt is timed, and requires students to write in response to a passage that is read on the computer. Each grade level receives a different prompt and reading passage. Student responses are scored using an item specific rubric. Growth percentiles will be examined when the data is collected in June.</p>					

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																																				
		<p>At the end of each Unit of Study, the classroom teacher administers a Unit of Study Writing Prompt within the genre taught (i.e.: Memoir, Feature Article, Short Fiction, and Book Review). The writing pieces are then scored using a rubric specific to the piece.</p> <p>The information collected from all of the above sources is then compiled in a PPMCC sheet (rainbow sheet) for each individual classroom. Management and Evaluation Associates then compile classroom, school, and district percentages.</p>																																				
Academic Achievement - Mathematics	<p>NJASK</p> <p>Quarterly District Mathematics Benchmark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Benchmark 1: Number Sense and Operations• Benchmark 2: Data Analysis, Probability and Discreet Math• Benchmark 3: Geometry and Measurement• Benchmark 4: Patterns and Algebra <p>Math Fluency Assessment</p>	<p>NJASK math data from 2014 revealed the following:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="6">Grade 3 Math – NJ ASK Results</th></tr><tr><th>Cluster</th><th>% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean</th><th>Just Proficient Mean</th><th>Points Earned</th><th>Total Possible Points</th><th>% of Total</th></tr><tr><td>Operations and Algebraic Thinking</td><td>7.18%</td><td>7.1</td><td>7.6</td><td>14</td><td>54.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Numbers and Operations in Base Ten</td><td>-10.33%</td><td>3.4</td><td>3.0</td><td>6</td><td>50.8%</td></tr><tr><td>Numbers and Operations - Fractions</td><td>6.55%</td><td>3.8</td><td>4.0</td><td>11</td><td>36.8%</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement and Data</td><td>8.77%</td><td>7.4</td><td>8.0</td><td>13</td><td>61.9%</td></tr></table>	Grade 3 Math – NJ ASK Results						Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points	% of Total	Operations and Algebraic Thinking	7.18%	7.1	7.6	14	54.4%	Numbers and Operations in Base Ten	-10.33%	3.4	3.0	6	50.8%	Numbers and Operations - Fractions	6.55%	3.8	4.0	11	36.8%	Measurement and Data	8.77%	7.4	8.0	13	61.9%
Grade 3 Math – NJ ASK Results																																						
Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points	% of Total																																	
Operations and Algebraic Thinking	7.18%	7.1	7.6	14	54.4%																																	
Numbers and Operations in Base Ten	-10.33%	3.4	3.0	6	50.8%																																	
Numbers and Operations - Fractions	6.55%	3.8	4.0	11	36.8%																																	
Measurement and Data	8.77%	7.4	8.0	13	61.9%																																	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)					
		Geometry	-11.51%	4.3	3.8	6	63.4%
		Grade 4 Math – NJ ASK Results					
		Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points	% of Total
		Operations and Algebraic Thinking	4.85%	3.9	4.1	10	40.9%
		Numbers and Operations in Base Ten	1.08%	5.6	5.7	10	56.6%
		Numbers and Operations - Fractions	1.33%	8.3	8.4	18	46.7%
		Measurement and Data	9.52%	3	3.3	6	54.8%
		Geometry	10.93%	3.3	3.7	6	61.0%
		Grade 5 Math – NJ ASK Results					
		Cluster	% Above or Below Just Proficient Mean	Just Proficient Mean	Points Earned	Total Possible Points	% of Total

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																	
		Operations and Algebraic Thinking	24.53%	3.1	3.9	6	64.3%												
		Numbers and Operations in Base Ten	12.90%	6.2	7.0	11	63.6%												
		Numbers and Operations - Fractions	39.53%	5.9	8.2	14	58.8%												
		Measurement and Data	46.72%	5.5	8.1	13	62.1%												
		Geometry	26.15%	3.3	4.2	6	69.4%												
		A Math Fluency Assessment Is administered four times yearly and analyzed. Teachers also practice daily in their individual classrooms. Grades K, 1, and 2 complete an addition and subtraction assessment. Grades 3 and 4 complete a multiplication and division assessment, and Grade 5 completes a fraction assessment. Grade level meetings are held, and growth is examined after each administration. The results show moderate growth over the course of the year.																	
		<table><tr><th colspan="3">Math Fluency Assessment Averages (Out of 32 Possible)</th></tr><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Fluency 1 - September</th><th>Fluency 3 - March</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>19</td><td>28</td></tr></table>						Math Fluency Assessment Averages (Out of 32 Possible)			Grade	Fluency 1 - September	Fluency 3 - March	3	1	20	4	19	28
		Math Fluency Assessment Averages (Out of 32 Possible)																	
		Grade	Fluency 1 - September	Fluency 3 - March															
		3	1	20															
4	19	28																	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)		
		5	10	22
		Math Benchmark Assessments are administered four times a year on specific mathematic topics. A pretest and posttest is administered for each benchmark topic. Benchmark 1 is Number Sense and Operations, Benchmark 2 is Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Math, Benchmark 3 is Geometry and Measurement, and Benchmark 4 is Patterns and Algebra. Results show moderate growth for each benchmark administered.		
		Benchmark 1 Assessment: Number Sense and Operations		
		Grade	Pretest	Posttest
		3	45%	53%
		4	42%	56%
		5	32%	59%
		Benchmark 2 Assessment: Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Math		
		Grade	Pretest	Posttest
		3	24%	50%
4	28%	53%		
5	25%	51%		

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)		
		Benchmark 3 Assessment: Geometry and Measurement		
		Grade	Pretest	Posttest
		3	34%	71%
		4	36%	52%
		5	24%	50%
Family and Community Engagement	Student Parent/School Compact Parent Survey Open House Awards Assemblies Parent Teacher Conferences Monthly PAC Meeting Attendance Winter Holiday Show Multicultural Week Spring Showcase Title 1 After School Program Title 1 Summer School Program Multi-Cultural Week Parent Workshops On Literacy, ESL, and Library Access Uniform Sale with 4M Fashions for Kids Annual Oratorical Contest Annual Spelling Bee Honor Roll Assemblies Citizenship Assemblies Gator Gazette—school newspaper	<p>Parents attend a monthly PAC meeting. A guest speaker from the building or community is invited to speak to our parents about a variety of topics.</p> <p>The School Compact was sent home and signed by parents, teachers, and students.</p> <p>186 of our parents attended the 2014-2015 Open House.</p> <p>Parent Teacher Conferences were at 90% for our second year. Parents come in to the school to meet with the teacher in order to receive the student's report card for the first marking period. Parents are also invited to come in on an as needed basis to meet with the principal and teacher.</p> <p>The Winter Holiday Shows and Spring Showcases were well attended by parents and family members. The shows were also recorded and televised by the local TV station.</p> <p>The Multicultural Week was a well-planned week of activities showcasing the diversity and cultures in the Brighton Avenue School. Teachers selected a country and engaged students in a study of that countries culture. They each made a display outside of each classroom, to be judged during a contest. One day was dedicated to food and parents were encouraged to bring in food representing their country of origin. The culminating activity was an assembly showcasing the dance and music of many countries.</p>		

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
	<p>The Garden Club</p> <p>Environmental Club</p> <p>Art Club</p> <p>Multicultural Club</p> <p>Fitness Club</p> <p>Red Ribbon Week—Anti Drugs, Alcohol, Tobacco & Violence</p> <p>Soccer</p> <p>Cheerleading</p> <p>Kickball</p> <p>Volleyball</p> <p>Floor Hockey</p> <p>Field Hockey</p> <p>Boys and Girls Basketball</p> <p>Winter Music Festival</p> <p>Open House</p> <p>Parent Student Orientation</p> <p>SES Tutoring</p> <p>Science Expo</p> <p>Career Day</p> <p>Jump Start Read</p> <p>Red Nose Day</p> <p>Blowing Bubbles for Autism</p> <p>Read Across America</p> <p>Book Fair</p> <p>Black History Expo</p> <p>Pizza and Police</p>	<p>Parents participated and provided the school with information and artifacts from their countries.</p> <p>Science Expo was a school-wide event where classes met to observe, discuss, and present various experiments presented by classrooms and grade levels. An assembly was held with a scientific demonstration and discussion led by a faculty member.</p> <p>Career Day was a school-wide event that served to promote interest in various career options. It is our vision to prepare students that are college bound and career ready. In order to achieve this vision, we need the assistance of our parents, community members, and public figures, so that together we may educate students on the importance of furthering their education and the vast career opportunities that are open to them.</p> <p>Read Across America Day is celebrated each year on or near Dr. Seuss's birthday on March 2. It is a day to celebrate reading, and for all members of the community to come together to promote literacy. Motivating children to read is an important factor in reading achievement, and Read Across America Day aims to promote a life-long love of reading. Some of the guests who read to students included: Bob Kelly (Former Philadelphia Flyer), Ted Greenberg (NBC10 Newscaster), Mayor Becker (Margate), Mayor Guardian (Atlantic City), Ashley Fairfield (Former Miss New Jersey), and various other members of the community including military officers, firefighters, policeman, judges, lawyers, nurses, volunteers, librarians, etc.</p> <p>Black History Expo was held in honor of Black History month. The expo afforded all students the opportunity to view various artifacts that related to black history. The students also watched a short video that showcased influential African Americans in the area that contributed to Atlantic City.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
Professional Development	Initial Literacy Training Ongoing Literacy Training Literacy Collaborative Coaching K-1 Grade Cohorts Mathematics Coaching Grade Level Meetings Faculty Meetings Professional Pearson Math In-Services Professional Pearson Science In-Services Professional Nystrom Social Studies In-Services District Wide In-Services	<p>Six teachers attended initial Literacy Training. The teachers were instructed to implement the literacy framework in their classrooms.</p> <p>Additionally, all teachers received additional professional development through Ongoing Literacy Training (4 hour long sessions, and one 2 hour session).</p> <p>A district wide professional development day (full day) was scheduled on Jan. 30, where teachers had the opportunity to attend two self-selected workshops in the areas of literacy, math, technology, science, or social studies.</p> <p>Grade level meetings are scheduled monthly to analyze data and discuss instructional practices.</p> <p>Based on the reflections and dialogue of the staff, it appeared that all professional development offered by the Atlantic City School District and Brighton Avenue School on various topics on education were well-received and implemented in the various classrooms.</p>
Leadership	District Leadership Team Meetings School Climate Inventory (SCI)	<p>The purpose of the School Climate Inventory (SCI) is to obtain feedback from school staff on school climate, a variable highly correlated with school effectiveness and student achievement, and to develop strategies to address climate factors that may inhibit or limit school effectiveness and student achievement. The seven dimensions of the inventory are: collaboration, environment, expectations, instruction, involvement, leadership, and order.</p> <p>The School Climate Inventory Survey results indicated 100 percent of teachers strongly agree or agree that students are expected to: resolve conflicts peacefully, instructional methods respect different student learning</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		<p>styles, content and performance standards guide the learning activities that teachers choose, students of different social and cultural backgrounds behave positively towards one another, faculty and staff cooperate a great deal to achieve school goals, teachers are proud of this school and its students, students are expected to achieve at high levels, and student behavior is generally positive.</p> <p>Areas with the most improvement over the past year included: parents are invited to serve on school advisory committees, teachers, administrators, and parents assume joint responsibility for student discipline, faculty and staff cooperate a great deal in trying to achieve school goals, and the school's principal is fair and consistent in addressing disciplinary issues.</p>
School Climate and Culture	<p>School Climate Inventory (SCI)</p> <p>Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices Survey</p> <p>Behavioral Characteristics of Students (BCS)</p> <p>Student, Instructional Staff and Parent Satisfaction Surveys</p> <p>After School Program Survey (ASPS)</p>	<p>The purpose of the School Climate Inventory (SCI) is to obtain feedback from school staff on school climate, a variable highly correlated with school effectiveness and student achievement, and to develop strategies to address climate factors that may inhibit or limit school effectiveness and student achievement. The seven dimensions of the inventory are: collaboration, environment, expectations, instruction, involvement, leadership, and order.</p> <p>The purpose of the Implementation and Impact of Instructional Practices Survey is to obtain feedback from instructional staff designed to: improve the effectiveness of instruction at all grade levels, in order to ensure that students are college and career ready; and to make ongoing and future decisions about teaching and learning practices. Survey respondents are asked to rate the literacy instructional program in the following areas: professional development; classroom coaching; literacy coach(s); frequency of use of the literacy framework/curriculum; their skill at teaching the literacy framework/curriculum; impact of the literacy framework/curriculum on student literacy skills and motivation; and use of data received from the Fountas and Pinnell benchmark assessment. In addition, respondents are asked for feedback on: the LoTi Walk-Thru Look-Fors; positive comments;</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		<p>suggestions for improvement; and program challenges. Survey respondents are also asked to rate the mathematics instructional program on a range of areas similar to those for the literacy program.</p> <p>The purpose of the Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of Students (BCS) is to obtain feedback from students on the behavior of other students, on character traits associated with student achievement, and to develop strategies to address behaviors that may inhibit or limit student achievement. The BCS measures 10 dimensions: respect, honesty, self-control, responsibility, courtesy, generosity, perseverance, cooperation, compassion, and forgiveness.</p> <p>The purpose of the Student, Instructional Staff and Parent Satisfaction Surveys is to obtain feedback from students, instructional staff and parents on the importance, and level of satisfaction with school services, and to use their perceptions to make school improvements. Students are asked to rate a wide range of school services such as curriculum and instruction; technology in the classroom etc. on both their level of importance, and on the student's level of satisfaction with the services. Students are also asked what they like and dislike about the school that they attend. Instructional staff and parents are asked for their perceptions about their school on a range of areas to those on the Student Survey. The Parent Survey is available in both English and Spanish.</p> <p>The purpose of the Student, Staff, and Parent/Guardian After School Program Surveys is to obtain feedback about the After School Program from students, staff, and parents/guardians designed to improve future After School Programs. Students are asked to rate the After School Program in the following areas: understanding of the purpose of the program; their attitude toward school as a result of participation in the program; their self-esteem as a result of participation in the program; their academic</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)
		<p>achievement as a result of participation in the program; the dinner program; the food services programs; program strengths; program weaknesses; and suggestions for program improvement. Staff and parents/guardians are asked to rate the After School Program on a range of areas similar to those on the Student After School Survey. In addition, parents/guardians are asked to rate the services provided by the Title I Parent Resource Centers.</p> <p>Data from the Behavioral Characteristics of Students (BCS), Student, Instructional Staff and Parent Satisfaction Surveys, and After School Program Survey (ASPS) will be available in June.</p>
School-Based Youth Services	Bullying Assemblies Red Ribbon Week Various Assemblies on Cultural Awareness	<p>All students attended a bullying assembly in October. This assembly encouraged a Bully Free School Zone, where all students are respected for their differences.</p> <p>Red Ribbon Week is an alcohol, tobacco, drug, and violence prevention awareness campaign observed annually in October in the United States. Red Ribbon Week began after the kidnapping, torture, and murder of DEA agent Enrique "Kiki" Camarena in 1985. Brighton Avenue School observed Red Ribbon Week in February and collaborated with the Atlantic City Police Department Community Policing Department to developed structured educational activities for a week of education, fun, and awareness for our students and community.</p> <p>The guidance counselor prepared Red Ribbon Week for the entire school. Students were spoken to during lunch and encouraged to wear their red ribbons and to stay away from drugs and alcohol. The fifth grade students attended an assembly every day of this week. The assembly included a DARE Police Officer, music, videos, group projects, and a school pledge.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																								
English Language Learners	WIDA Access 2014 NJASK 2014	<p>Fully English language proficient (ELP) students demonstrate proficient reading, writing, and comprehension abilities of academic English and other academic areas.</p> <p>Students who attain a composite score of 6.0 on the ACCESS for ELLs test achieve an ELP 6 Language Level and are no longer classified as an English Language Learner.</p> <p>The district is required to monitor all fully English language proficient students for the first two school years after they exit from ELL/LEP classification.</p> <p>The students who exited the program in 2014 were placed in general education classrooms, due to the limited numbers of ESL teachers.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">WIDA ACCESS 2014 Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Oral Language, Literacy, and Comprehension Exited the ESL Program based on the ACCESS for ELLs test</p> <table><tr><th>Grade Level 2014-15 School Year</th><th>Students with F1 LEP status</th><th>Students in Grade Level</th><th>Percentage of Students with F1 LEP Status</th></tr><tr><td>First Grade</td><td>8</td><td>66</td><td>12.12%</td></tr><tr><td>Second Grade</td><td>7</td><td>73</td><td>9.58%</td></tr><tr><td>Third Grade</td><td>9</td><td>63</td><td>14.28%</td></tr><tr><td>Fourth Grade</td><td>12</td><td>46</td><td>26.08%</td></tr><tr><td>Fifth Grade</td><td>3</td><td>50</td><td>6%</td></tr></table>	Grade Level 2014-15 School Year	Students with F1 LEP status	Students in Grade Level	Percentage of Students with F1 LEP Status	First Grade	8	66	12.12%	Second Grade	7	73	9.58%	Third Grade	9	63	14.28%	Fourth Grade	12	46	26.08%	Fifth Grade	3	50	6%
Grade Level 2014-15 School Year	Students with F1 LEP status	Students in Grade Level	Percentage of Students with F1 LEP Status																							
First Grade	8	66	12.12%																							
Second Grade	7	73	9.58%																							
Third Grade	9	63	14.28%																							
Fourth Grade	12	46	26.08%																							
Fifth Grade	3	50	6%																							

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Areas	Multiple Measures Analyzed	Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)																																
Economically Disadvantaged	NJASK 2014 Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)	<p>NJASK data for Economically Disadvantaged students revealed the following:</p> <p>NJ ASK Language Arts Literacy 2014 Results for Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup</p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Advanced Proficient</th><th>Proficient</th><th>Partially Proficient</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>0%</td><td>42%</td><td>58%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>2%</td><td>39%</td><td>59%</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>0%</td><td>47%</td><td>53%</td></tr></table> <p>NJ ASK Math 2014 Results for Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup</p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Advanced Proficient</th><th>Proficient</th><th>Partially Proficient</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>11%</td><td>44%</td><td>44%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>18%</td><td>41%</td><td>41%</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>26%</td><td>55%</td><td>18%</td></tr></table>	Grade	Advanced Proficient	Proficient	Partially Proficient	3	0%	42%	58%	4	2%	39%	59%	5	0%	47%	53%	Grade	Advanced Proficient	Proficient	Partially Proficient	3	11%	44%	44%	4	18%	41%	41%	5	26%	55%	18%
Grade	Advanced Proficient	Proficient	Partially Proficient																															
3	0%	42%	58%																															
4	2%	39%	59%																															
5	0%	47%	53%																															
Grade	Advanced Proficient	Proficient	Partially Proficient																															
3	11%	44%	44%																															
4	18%	41%	41%																															
5	26%	55%	18%																															

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process* ***Narrative***

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment?

The process of collecting, reviewing, and gathering information from all of the stakeholders pertinent to the needs assessment of our school involves the following: Administrative meetings, faculty meetings, grade-level meetings, PAC, school and district Leadership Team meetings, ELA Portfolios, ELA assessments, Math benchmarks, surveys, staff evaluations and walkthroughs, and I&RS meetings.

2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?

Teachers are required to use literacy assessments throughout the year for grades K-5. The data is compiled by charting the results of literacy assessments under the guidance and assistance of Management and Evaluation Associates, Inc. of Hightstown, NJ. Further, the SRI and ePASK assessment results are available in customized reports for various student subgroups. Math assessment results were collected and disseminated in reports by the math coach.

3. How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?

Validity and reliability for each of the needs assessment data is as follows: state and local end of year assessments tests – standard validity and reliability is established by the test publishers; benchmark assessment tests – standard validity and reliability for selected test items is established by the publishers; surveys – standard validity and reliability is established by the survey publishers; face and content validity apply to all other data sources identified above.

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?

The data revealed the need to continue with the implementation of sheltered classrooms with the ESL program. Special decisions must be made to ensure the proper teacher instructs our ELLs. We must also consider making the sheltered classrooms sizes smaller.

5. What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Data revealed the ongoing need for professional development in both language arts literacy and math. According to the Implementation and Impact of Effective Instructional Practices survey, teachers value literacy professional development sessions and coaching sessions in relationship to their impact on both teaching and the ability to understand students. Specifically in language arts literacy, teachers expressed the most concern with increasing their skill in implementation of Writing Workshop. In mathematics, teachers expressed a desire to receive more professional development and coaching in math. Specifically in math, they would like to gain a deeper understanding of the PARCC, increase focus in classes, and increase rigor in math classes.

6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?

Possible at-risk students are identified early, due in part to the ongoing monthly assessments assigned by the district. There are several assessments given during the first month of school that will allow a teacher to identify a student in possible need of “extra assistance.” Once a student has been identified as at-risk, he or she is brought before the I & RS committee, where all of the concerns are addressed in a professional and timely manner. Based on the information provided by the classroom teacher, parent, and assessment results, the team will suggest the best possible interventions for that student. Interventions may include the following: Reading Recovery, Leveled Literacy Intervention, Basic Skills Intervention, After School Program, and an additional guided reading lesson.

7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students?

Once a student has been identified as at-risk, he or she is brought before the I & RS committee, where all of the concerns are addressed in a professional and timely manner. Based on the information provided by the classroom teacher, parent, and assessment results, the team will suggest the best possible interventions for that student. Interventions may include the following: Reading Recovery, Leveled Literacy Intervention, Basic Skill Intervention, After School Program, and an additional guided reading lesson.

8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students? N/A

9. How does the school address the needs of homeless students? N/A

10. How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?

Teachers are encouraged by the active leadership of the administration to voice suggestions, opinions, and concerns. They are given many opportunities for professional development and coaching. All teachers participate in cluster coaching where they are encouraged to

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

watch their colleagues teach and take part in a discussion on the lessons. In addition to team meetings, we have utilized grade level meetings to discuss the use of data and the academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program.

11. How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school?

- The District provides information to parents via the parent centers, schools, media, community providers, and collaborations.
- Early Registration for preschool begins in March and is on-going throughout the school year. Registration continues during the summer.
- Preschool Parent or Guardian/Child Orientation is held during the summer in the perspective schools. An invitational letter is sent to each parent/guardian to bring the child to orientation. Special events are an important part of orientation. (Examples of activities: Preschool and Kindergarten Breakfast, Preschool and Kindergarten Tea Party, and Preschool and Kindergarten Orientation Games)
- Meet the Preschool and Kindergarten Teachers Day Forums - During the months of October and May, preschool and kindergarten teachers (including special needs preschool) present a forum and parents (guardians) have the opportunity to meet and discuss Early Childhood Education in Atlantic City Schools. Early Childhood Education Staff have the opportunity to meet preschool parent/guardians and answer questions about the preschool program.
- “My Trip to the Kindergarten School Day” –During the month of May, students and parents/guardians will travel to a school and meet a kindergarten principal, assistant principal, and teacher. Students will participate in a kindergarten classroom activity.
- Fliers announcing preschool/early registration are disseminated during report card periods.
- Preschool teachers give parents and guardians tips for preparing their children for kindergarten.
- The Atlantic City Schools Early Childhood Program Community Committee meets four times a year to discuss high quality preschool and kindergarten curricula, community resources, and preschool transition.
- Preschool student needs are identified and student portfolios are sent to kindergarten teachers.
- Parent/guardian workshops are given by the District Supervisor of Early Childhood Education, preschool/kindergarten teachers, and Parent Resource Centers.
- The preschool curriculum is a prerequisite to and aligned to the kindergarten curriculum. Preschool students making the transition have prior background knowledge for what will be taught in kindergarten.
- Kindergarten teachers call and/or write letters to parents or guardians and children before school begins in September.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)

- During the school year, there is an open house for kindergarten parents.
- There is a strong communication with elementary principals and the preschool program in Atlantic City Schools. Teams of early childhood education staff are instrumental in providing transitional activities during the school year.
- High quality classrooms are provided in preschool and kindergarten.
- There is a strong communication and collaboration with the home, community, and school.
- Questionnaires are sent to parents/guardians about their children, prior to entering kindergarten.

12. How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan?

The selection of school priority problems and root causes for the 2014-2015 schoolwide plan was conducted by a school-based team, led by the Principal, following district wide meetings led by the Superintendent, central office administrators and M&E, district and state assessments, surveys, and concerns generated collaboratively at the schoolwide improvement meetings.

**Provide a separate response for each question.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them*

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

	#1	#2
Name of priority problem	Language Arts Literacy	Mathematics
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	<p>Many students need to show substantial growth in reading ability to be considered reading at or above grade level.</p> <p>SRI results from September to May indicate that students who scored in the advanced (above level) or proficient (on-level) categories increased by 19% in third grade, 17% in fourth grade, and 40% in fifth grade. This data suggests moderate to significant growth in the population of students reading at or above grade level.</p> <p>Students in Grade 2 showed a 7% growth in the percentage of students reading on grade level based upon Benchmark Assessment data. In the beginning of the year, 48% were at or above a Level J, and at the mid-year benchmark 55% were at a Level L. This data suggests moderate growth in students reading at or above grade level.</p>	<p>Many students need to show substantial growth in Math fluency and on quarterly Math benchmarks.</p> <p>Students in Grades 2-5 showed moderate growth on the Math Fluency Assessments over time (September to March administration). Grade 3 increased the total points average on the Math Fluency Assessment by 19 points, Grade 4 by 9 points, and Grade 5 by 12 points.</p> <p>Students in Grades 2-5 showed moderate growth on performance in the various Benchmark Assessments. Benchmark 1 (Number Sense and Operations) showed 8% growth in Grade 3, 14% in Grade 4, and 27% in Grade 5. Benchmark 2 (Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Math) showed 26% growth in Grade 3, 25% in Grade 4, and 26% in Grade 5. Benchmark 3 (Geometry and Measurement) showed 37% growth in Grade 3, 16% growth in Grade 4, and 26% growth in Grade 5.</p>
Describe the root causes of the problem	<p>Students are reading below level. Language acquisition for ELL students is a root cause of the problem. Sheltered classrooms require more assistance and intensive help in language acquisition. Such language acquisition may require increasing the number of basic skills interventionists (LLI/Reading Recovery) and ESL teachers, as well reducing the size of ELL classrooms.</p>	<p>Students are reading below level, which may also impact math performance on language-based problems. Language acquisition for ELL students is a root cause of the problem. Sheltered classrooms require more assistance and intensive help in language acquisition. Students are not memorizing all of their facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, and fractions). They may require additional practice in class or at home using a variety of strategies.</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

Subgroups or populations addressed	English Language Learners	English Language Learners
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	<p>Language Arts Literacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building background knowledge and vocabulary • Integrating Science and Social Studies in the curriculum • Thinking within, about, and beyond the text • Fluency 	<p>Building Math Fluency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades K, 1 and 2 - Addition and Subtraction Fluency • Grades 3 and 4 - Multiplication and Division Fluency • Grade 5 - Fraction Fluency <p>Math Benchmarks –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmark 1 Number Sense and Operations • Benchmark 2 Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Math • Benchmark 3 Geometry and Measurement • Benchmark 4 Patterns and Algebra
Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Literacy Collaborative Framework (Lesley University) is a research based instructional model that is language based, student-centered, and process-oriented. The teachers will continue to teach the components of Reading and Writing Workshop, as well as Language/Word Study. The literacy model allows for student-centered differentiated instruction. Reading Recovery, Leveled Literacy Intervention, and Basic Skills Instruction are interventions that help support language arts literacy instruction.	“Big Ideas” describe what needs to be taught for each grade level. The 5E instructional mathematics model provides a format for lessons that builds on what students already know. The 5E’s sequence the learning experience so that learners construct their understanding of a concept across time. Each phase of the learning sequence can be described using five words that begin with “E”: engage, explore, explain, extend, and evaluate.
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	Literacy Collaborative Framework and Reading Recovery fully support and are aligned with the Common Core State Standards through extensive professional development in literacy for teachers, collection and analysis of data on student reading and writing performance, professional resource materials, and coaching sessions with literacy coordinators.	The design of the 5E math model and “Big Ideas” is aligned to the Common Core. Research reports from institutions such as the National Research Center support the effectiveness of the 5E model.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)*

2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process *Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)*

	#3	#4
Name of priority problem	Parent/Community Involvement	
Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources	<p>Increasing parental involvement within school related activities.</p> <p>186 of our parents attended the 2014-2015 Open House.</p>	
Describe the root causes of the problem	<p>Brighton Avenue School reopened in September 2013 to alleviate the overcrowding at Texas and Sovereign Avenue School. Sovereign and Texas Avenue have established workshops and classes for their parents. Brighton Avenue School needs to offer parents more workshops and activities that will give parents an opportunity to visit.</p> <p>Although more workshops for parents were offered in 2014-2015 and attendance of parents increased, more significant growth is warranted. Brighton Avenue should have comparable rates of attendance and a comparable number of workshops to other schools in the district.</p>	
Subgroups or populations addressed	All	
Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)	N/A	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(A)

Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems	Research on the effects of parental involvement has shown a consistent, positive relationship between parent's engagement in their children's education and student outcomes. Studies have also shown that parental involvement is associated with student outcomes such as lower dropout and truancy rates. Whether or not parental involvement can improve student outcomes is no longer in question. Brighton Avenue would like to increase the number of workshop offerings for parents to an average of 2 per month, in addition to a monthly PAC meeting.	
How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?	N/A	

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . “

2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	All students in grades K-5	Literacy Collaborative Framework	Administration, Coaches, and Teachers	Making AYP (English Language Arts) Portfolio Assessment Growth on Various Assessments (as recorded on the district Portfolio Progress Monitoring Checklist) Model Curriculum/CCSS SRI Reading Benchmarks LLI	<p>Literacy Collaborative Framework (Lesley University) is a research based instructional model that is language based, student-centered, and process-oriented. The teachers will continue to teach the components of the Reading and Writing Workshops, as well as Language/Word Study. Literacy Collaborative has also been studied by the Center for Research and Educational Policy at the University of Memphis, the Education Development Center in Newton, Massachusetts, and the Center for Education Evaluation and Policy at Indiana University.</p> <p>The Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at the University of Memphis conducted a scientific study that assessed the efficacy of Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI). The study confirmed that LLI was effective in significantly improving the literacy achievement of struggling readers and writers. LLI will support what</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					is being taught in the core classroom and help to meet the Common Core State Standards by bringing struggling readers to grade level proficiency. At the end of each LLI lesson, the specific behaviors and understandings that are required for children to read successfully at that level are provided from The Continuum of Literacy Learning. Like the Common State Standards, the Continuum addresses the specific goals for helping students actively seek the wide, deep, and thoughtful engagement with high-quality literary and informational texts that builds knowledge, enlarges experience, and broadens worldviews.
ELA	Grade 1 students who meet the criteria for the intervention (lowest 20%)	Reading Recovery	Reading Recovery Teachers, Administration	Growth on Various Assessments (Letter ID, Concepts About Print, Word Reading, Reading Level, Writing Vocabulary, and Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words)	<p>The goal of Reading Recovery is to dramatically reduce the number of first-grade students who have extreme difficulty learning to read and write and to reduce the cost of these learners to educational systems.</p> <p>There are two positive outcomes for students:</p> <p>1 Since 1984 when Reading Recovery began in the United</p>

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					<p>States, approximately 75% of students who complete the full 12- to 20-week intervention can meet grade-level expectations in reading and writing. Follow-up studies indicate that most Reading Recovery students also do well on standardized tests and maintain their gains in later years.</p> <p>2 The few students who are still having difficulty after a complete intervention are recommended for further evaluation. Recommendations may be made for future support (e.g., classroom support, Title I, LD referral). This category represents a positive, supportive action on behalf of the child and the school. Diagnostic information from Reading Recovery is available to inform decisions about future actions. (Taken from readingrecovery.org) See What Works Clearinghouse for research supporting this intervention.</p>
ELA	Students in Grade	Leveled Literacy	Leveled	Growth on Various Assessments	The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	1-3 who are reading below level	Intervention	Literacy Intervention Teachers, Administration	(as recorded on the district Portfolio Progress Monitoring Checklist)	Literacy Intervention System (LLI) is a small-group, supplementary literacy intervention designed to help teachers provide powerful, daily, small-group instruction for the lowest achieving students at their grade level. Through systematically designed lessons and original, engaging leveled books, <i>LLI</i> supports learning in both reading and writing, helps students expand their knowledge of language and words and how they work. The goal of <i>LLI</i> is to bring students to grade level achievement in reading. (Taken from Heinemann.com)
Math	All students in grades K-5	Mathematics 5E Model	Administration, Math Coach, and Teachers	Making AYP (Mathematics) Mathematics Pre/Post Benchmarks Results on Math Fluency Assessments	The math approach used is a standards-based ninety minute Mathematics block in Kindergarten through fifth grade. The students acquire the necessary mathematical concepts, skills, and understanding that they need to be successful. We begin each mathematics lesson with the “Big Ideas,” which describes what needs to be taught for each grade level. The 5E instructional mathematics model provides a format for lessons that builds on what

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					<p>students already know. The 5E's sequence the learning experience so that learners construct their understanding of a concept across time. Each phase of the learning sequence can be described using five words that begin with "E": engage, explore, explain, extend, and evaluate, this model is used for all five of the standards.</p> <p>The design of the "Big Ideas" is aligned to the CCSS.</p>

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

<i>ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;</i>					
Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	All students in grades Kindergarten through Fifth	After School Program	Superintendent, and Assistant Superintendent, Title One Department, Principal, and	Growth on Various Assessments (as recorded on the district Portfolio Progress Monitoring Checklist) SRI Results Benchmark Assessments	Quality afterschool and summer learning programs make a positive difference, according to a new compendium authored by more than 100 researchers, educators, community leaders, policymakers,

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			Teachers	Attendance Rate Progress Monitoring AYP	and practitioners. Featuring an article by Danette Parsley, Director of the Center for Strengthening Education Systems at Education Northwest, Expanding Minds and Opportunities: Leveraging the Power of Afterschool and Summer Learning for Student Success [external link] offers specific examples from across the country of how this growing movement is turning “non-school hours” into “learning hours” for children and youth.
Math	All students in grades Kindergarten through Fifth	After School Program	Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Title I Department, Principal, and Teachers	Attendance Rate Progress Monitoring Pre/Post Mathematics Test AYP	Quality afterschool and summer learning programs make a positive difference, according to a new compendium authored by more than 100 researchers, educators, community leaders, policymakers, and practitioners. Featuring an article by Danette Parsley, Director of the Center for Strengthening Education Systems at Education Northwest, Expanding Minds and Opportunities: Leveraging the Power of Afterschool and Summer Learning for Student Success [external link] offers specific examples from across the country

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					of how this growing movement is turning “non-school hours” into “learning hours” for children and youth.
ELA	All students in grades Kindergarten through Fifth	Summer School	Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent, Title One Department, Principal, and Teachers	Growth on Various Assessments (as recorded on the district Portfolio Progress Monitoring Checklist) Benchmark Assessments Attendance Rate Progress Monitoring AYP	Quality afterschool and summer learning programs make a positive difference, according to a new compendium authored by more than 100 researchers, educators, community leaders, policymakers, and practitioners. Featuring an article by Danette Parsley, Director of the Center for Strengthening Education Systems at Education Northwest, Expanding Minds and Opportunities: Leveraging the Power of Afterschool and Summer Learning for Student Success [external link] offers specific examples from across the country of how this growing movement is turning “non-school hours” into “learning hours” for children and youth.
Math	All students in grades Kindergarten through Fifth	Summer School	Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent, Title One Department, Principal, and	Attendance Rate Progress Monitoring Pre/Post Mathematics Test AYP	Quality afterschool and summer learning programs make a positive difference, according to a new compendium authored by more than 100 researchers, educators,

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			Teachers		community leaders, policymakers, and practitioners. Featuring an article by Danette Parsley, Director of the Center for Strengthening Education Systems at Education Northwest, <i>Expanding Minds and Opportunities: Leveraging the Power of Afterschool and Summer Learning for Student Success</i> [external link] offers specific examples from across the country of how this growing movement is turning “non-school hours” into “learning hours” for children and youth.
*Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM)	*All interested students	*Summer School STEM Program (1-3 PM – Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursdays during July)	*Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent, Title I Department, Principal, Teachers	*Attendance Assessment of project-based learning experiences	*STEM education is a program of study that exposes students to technically sophisticated skills requiring the application of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics concepts. STEM combines inquiry based learning and rigorous academic concepts, coupled with real-world problem-based and performance-based lessons. STEM allows students to examine future careers in these areas, and promotes an active understanding of the practical application of science, technology,

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Intervention	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
					engineering, and math concepts.
*Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM)	*All interested students	*Saturday STEM program (Saturdays during the school year from 9 AM-12 PM)	*Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent, Title I Department, Principal, Teachers	*Attendance Assessment of project-based learning experiences	*STEM education is a program of study that exposes students to technically sophisticated skills requiring the application of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics concepts. STEM combines inquiry based learning and rigorous academic concepts, coupled with real-world problem-based and performance-based lessons. STEM allows students to examine future careers in these areas, and promotes an active understanding of the practical application of science, technology, engineering, and math concepts.
*All academic areas, as well as emotional and social wellness	*At risk students selected by leadership, guidance counselor, and/or teacher referral	*School-based Mentoring Program	*Title I Department, Principal, Teachers	*Attendance Performance in class Performance on various district assessments Survey	*A school-based mentoring program (similar to Big Brothers Big Sisters) can have a dramatic impact on students' achievement, engagement, behavior, self-efficacy, and emotional and social wellness. Members of the community will be selected to mentor at-risk students as a supplement to daily instruction and/or counseling.

****Use an asterisk to denote new programs.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
ELA	All Teachers	Literacy Collaborative On-Going Training	Central Administration, Principal, Literacy Supervisor, and Literacy Coaches	Implementation of the Literacy Framework Lesson Plans Formal Observations Informal Walk-throughs	The purpose of on-going literacy training is to revisit specific elements of the language and literacy framework in more detail, thus deepening the understanding of theory and practice and providing new thinking as the model is refined.
ELA	New teachers and teachers in a new placement (primary to intermediate, or intermediate to primary)	Literacy Collaborative Initial Training	Central Administration, Principal, Literacy Supervisor, Literacy Coaches, and Teachers	Understanding and implementation of the literacy framework. Carrying out training assignments. Reading about, discussing, and applying new learning. Participating in coaching sessions. Progress Monitoring Portfolios Benchmark Assessments SRI Results	Initial training is needed in order to effectively teach the complete language arts and literacy framework in the classroom. There are many differences between primary and intermediate training.
Math	All classroom	Mathematics Coaching	Central Administration,	Coaching sessions and the	On-site professional development

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
	teachers and support teachers in all grade levels		Principal, Math Supervisor, Math Coach, and Teachers	implementation of the 5E math model including the "Big Ideas." Lesson Plans Informal Walkthroughs	is the best way to provide support for teacher growth because professional conversations can take place formally and informally.
ELA and Math	All teachers	Principal's Meetings	Central Administration, Principal, Math Supervisor, Math Coach, Literacy Supervisor, Literacy Coaches	Understanding and implementation of the Math and Literacy Framework Reading, discussion, and application of new learning Portfolios Benchmark Assessments Fluency Results SRI Results Growth on Various Assessments (as recorded on the district Portfolio Progress Monitoring Checklist)	The afterschool Principal's meetings give coaches and teachers an opportunity to discuss concerns and find tools and solutions that can be applied to teaching immediately.
Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies and the Arts.	All Teachers	Book Study/Professional Articles Discussion	Principal Leadership Team	Participation	Teachers will take part in an annual Book Study with the reading and active discussion of professional articles and/or a book selected and ordered by the leadership team.

****Use an asterisk to denote new programs.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

Evaluation of Schoolwide Program*

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?

The Leadership Team will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016.

2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?

One challenge that we anticipate during the implementation process will be common planning periods so the Leadership Team can meet during the school day. Another challenge will be staffing. With our growing ESL population, we need to increase our ESL and basic skills interventionist staff, which may be impossible due to budgetary constraints. Also, due to extensive layoffs throughout the district, there will be less basic skills teachers, Reading Recovery teachers, Leveled Literacy teachers, literacy coaches, and classroom teachers to work with the students in the school and district. In addition, the leadership at the school is projected to change.

3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?

The school will obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders by reporting to the staff during faculty meetings and reporting to parents during monthly PAC meetings.

4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?

The School Climate Report will be used to gauge the perceptions of the staff and grade level meetings will be utilized to interact and discuss issues that need adjusting.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: Reform Strategies ESEA §(b)(1)(B)(i-iii)

5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?

All parent surveys and comments during the monthly PAC meetings will be used to gauge parent and community perceptions.

6. How will the school structure interventions?

BSI teachers will be used to help implement and support the ELA program (targeted support with guided reading) and Math program. ESL teachers will be assigned to all Sheltered Classrooms for at least the required amount of time per grade level. Kindergarten Classrooms will receive 60 minutes of ESL support daily and First through Fifth Grade will receive 90 minutes of ESL support daily.

7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?

Students will receive instructional interventions on a daily basis.

8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?

Students will complete technology-based assignments in the computer lab on a weekly basis. Lessons will include, but are not limited to: word processing, typing and using the tool bars, math practice, and reading stories and articles. Students will also utilize the computer lab and portable Chromebook carts to complete SRI testing and PARCC assessments.

9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?

Interventions will be assessed through progress monitoring using multiple measures including, but not limited to: Observation Survey, Running Records, Required District Assessments, and Math Fluency Assessments.

10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?

Data is collected through M & E throughout the school year. This data is presented to administrators and teachers during grade level meetings. Parents are informed of the school data during monthly PAC meetings.

****Provide a separate response for each question.***

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
Family Assistance	All Parents	Parent Resource Center	Superintendent, Principal, Vice-Principal, Title One Department	Parental participation Distribution of the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School supplies • Food • Clothing 	Research shows that a Parent Resource Center is a community based multi-disciplinary project that empowers parents with knowledge and skills needed to be effective parents. The Parent Resource Center has access to a variety of community members and services that are helpful to our student population. The resource center seeks out services from other schools, churches, community-based programs, and human service agencies.
Academic Behavioral Social	Parents, Teachers, and Students	PAC	PAC President and Administrators	Participation	Research suggests that students tend to perform better in school when their parents are actively engaged in school related activities. Parents are very important to their child's success in school.
Academic Social	Parents, Staff, and Students	Parent Resource Center Workshops	Superintendent, Principal, Vice-Principal, Title	Participation in the district-wide and school based workshops:	Research suggests that students tend to perform better in school when their parents are actively

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

Content Area Focus	Target Population(s)	Name of Strategy	Person Responsible	Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)	Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)
			One Department		engaged in school related activities. Parents are very important to their child's success in school.
Social Behavioral	Students, Parents, and Community Members	Community Cookout	Stop the Silence Committee	Community participation and decrease in citywide crime.	The cookouts, sponsored by the Stop The Silence Committee, are meant to bring community organizations together with community members.
Academic Social	Parents, Community Members, and Students	Parent Summit	Superintendent and Title One Department	Parental participation and increase of student successful behaviors.	The Parent Summit, sponsored by the Title One and Parent Resource, was meant to bring parents together to hear from the district's Superintendent. Parents were invited to visit displays from each school, eat dinner, watch an informative PowerPoint presentation, and ask questions.

**Use an asterisk to denote new programs.*

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment?

The school's family and community engagement program will assist with the understanding that all stakeholders are vital to the success of our shared vision. The school, parents, and community work together in meeting the needs of our school and more specifically the learners.

2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy?

The school will conduct a survey seeking parent's input.

The school will invite parents to attend a monthly PAC meeting.

The school will continue to have parents sit on the schoolwide improvement committee.

3. How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy?

Send home a copy of the Parent Involvement Policy with every student.

Have parents sign one of the copies.

Return signed copy to school.

Review content at the following gatherings: Open House, PAC, and Parent Teacher Conferences.

4. How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact?

Conduct a parent survey seeking parent input.

Develop the school-parent compact jointly with parents at the first PAC meeting.

Have teachers discuss the importance of the compact with parents during the Open House.

5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact?

Distributing the school parent-compact during Open House, PTC's, and to all new families.

Utilize the Connect-Ed system to remind parents that copies of the compact are available in the Main Office.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

6. How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community?

The school will report student achievement data to the families and community by mailing home the information, as well as addressing the topic during the PAC meetings. Parents will also be informed during Parent Teacher Conferences throughout the year.

7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III?

Notices will be sent home to all parents to notify them that district has not met its annual measurable objectives for Title III. Also, the information will be announced at the Atlantic City Board of Education meeting in early Fall.

8. How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results?

The school will inform the families and community of the school's disaggregated assessments results by PAC and informing them of the district's scheduled Board of Education meetings, which will address the results as a district.

9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan?

Parents and community members will be invited to attend PAC meetings that will discuss the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan and seek input at that time.

10. How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children?

The parents are informed of their child/children's academic achievement during Parent Teacher Conferences.

11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds?

The parent involvement funds will be used for various "based on need" workshops.

SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT *ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F)*

**Provide a separate response for each question.*

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA §(b)(1)(E)*

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff

	Number & Percent	Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff
Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	39	The Atlantic City Public Schools Human Resources Department identifies teachers that are highly qualified; certification documentation.
	100%	
Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A	0	
	0%	
Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)	1	The Brighton Avenue School has one Bengali Instructional Aide who is Highly Qualified.
	100%	
Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications required by <i>ESEA</i> (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*	0	
	0	

* The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF *ESEA §(b)(1)(E)*

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools	Individuals Responsible
The Human Resources Department is responsible for screening all applicants to ensure they are highly qualified.	Human Resources